



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,606	07/07/2003	Richard W. Fabrick II	P2415	7780
7590 Henneman & Saunders 714 W. Michigan Ave. Three Rivers, MI 49093				
08/07/2008				
EXAMINER				
PITARO, RYAN F				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/07/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/614,606

**Applicant(s)**

FABRICK, RICHARD W.

**Examiner**

RYAN F. PITARO

**Art Unit**

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-45 have been examined.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. This action is in response to the amendment filed 4/28/2008.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 14-15, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haken ("Haken" US 7,124,374).

As per claim 14, Haken teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining if the position indicated by the pointing device is a position that corresponds to another one of the displays includes: determining which of the plurality of displays is an active display (Column 2 lines 62-Column 3 lines 15);

Art Unit: 2178

determining whether the pointing device is indicating a position near a specific edge (Column 3 lines 39-68); and determining if there is a display in a direction indicated by the specific edge (Column 3 lines 39-68).

As per claim 15, Haken teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, wherein: the position indicated by the pointing device is a left edge (Figure 1).

Claim 29 is similar in scope to that of claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 30 is similar in scope to that of claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-11,16-26,31-33,37-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haken ("Haken", US 7,124,374) in view of Keller ("Keller", US 6,842,795).

As per claim 1, Haken teaches a pointing device control method for mapping a pointing device to a plurality of displays (Figure1), comprising: mapping the pointing device to a first one of the displays (Column 3 lines 16-19); detecting a position indicated by the pointing device (Column 3 lines 16-19); determining if the position indicated by the pointing device is a position that corresponds to another one of the displays (Column 3 lines 16-19). Haken fails to distinctly point out remapping since he uses a relative pointing device. However, Keller teaches remapping the pointing device to the other one of the displays (Column 4 lines 1-31, shifting focus with an input device, (stylus)). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Keller with the method of Haken. Motivation to do so would have been to provide more accurate representation than relative methods.

As per claim 2, Haken-Keller teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, wherein the position corresponding to the other display is near an edge (Haken, Column 3 lines 16-19, Column 3 lines 36-39).

As per claim 3, Haken-Keller fails to expressly teach the pointing device control method of claim 2, wherein the edge is an edge of a graphics tablet (Keller, Column 4 lines 9-20) .

As per claim 4, Haken-Keller teaches the pointing device control method of claim 2 wherein the edge is an edge of an active display (Haken, Column 3 lines 1-15).

As per claim 5, Haken-Keller teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, wherein the pointing device is an absolute pointing device (Keller, Column 4 lines 21-30).

As per claim 6, Haken-Keller teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1 wherein the pointing device includes a graphics tablet (Keller, Column 4 lines 9-20).

As per claim 7, Haken-Keller teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, wherein the pointing device includes a stylus (Keller, Column 4 lines 21-30).

As per claim 8, Haken-Keller teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1 wherein remapping the pointing device includes changing which of the plurality of displays is controlled by the pointing device (Haken, Column 3 lines 16-20).

As per claim 9, Haken-Keller teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, and further including a preliminary step of defining the width of a proximity zone near an edge to establish the position corresponding to the other monitor (Haken, Column 3 lines 16-20).

As per claim 10, Haken-Keller teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, and further including a preliminary step of identifying and storing the relative positions each of the plurality of displays (Haken, Column 3 lines 35-37 and Keller, Column 9 lines 17-25).

As per claim 11, Haken-Keller teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, and further including: a preliminary step of recording the existence or nonexistence of a display on the left of each of the plurality of displays; and a preliminary step of recording the existence or nonexistence of a display on the right of each of the plurality of displays (Haken, Column 2 lines 62-Column 3 lines 15, Figure 1).

Claim 16 is similar in scope to that of claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to that of claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to that of claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to that of claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to that of claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to that of claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to that of claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to that of claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is similar in scope to that of claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.



Claim 25 is similar in scope to that of claim 10, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to that of claim 11, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 31, Haken teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising: a position field containing data representing a position for triggering a process for remapping a pointing device to another display (Column 3 lines 35-38); and a position field containing data representing the position of the pointing device (Column 4 lines 3-19). Haken fails to distinctly point out remapping since he uses a relative pointing device. However, Keller teaches remapping the pointing device to the other one of the displays (Column 4 lines 1-31, shifting focus with an input device, (stylus)). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Keller with the method of Haken. Motivation to do so would have been to provide more accurate representation than relative methods.

As per claim 32, Haken-Keller teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 31, wherein the position field contains data representing the width of an area near an edge (Haken, Column 4 lines 3-19, Figure 2).

As per claim 33, Haken-Keller teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 32, wherein: the pointing device includes a graphics tablet and a stylus; and the edge is an edge of the graphics tablet (Keller, Column 4 lines 21-30).

As per claim 37, Haken-Keller teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 31, and further including an adjacent monitor field containing data representing the presence of a display adjacent an active monitor (Haken, Column 3 lines 35-39).

As per claim 38, Haken teaches a graphics display system comprising: a plurality of displays (Figure 1); a pointing device (Figure 1); a position monitor (Column 3 lines 16-39); and a remapper responsive to output from said position monitor, and operative to automatically remap the pointing device from one of the displays to another one of the displays (Column 3 lines 16-39). Haken fails to distinctly point out remapping since he uses a relative pointing device. However, Keller teaches remapping the pointing device to the other one of the displays (Column 4 lines 1-31, shifting focus with an input device, (stylus)). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Keller with the method of

Haken. Motivation to do so would have been to provide more accurate representation than relative methods.

As per claim 39, Haken teaches a graphics display system comprising: a plurality of displays (Figure 1); a pointing device (Figure 1); and means for automatically remapping the pointing device from one of the displays to another one of the displays (Column 3 lines 16-39). Haken fails to distinctly point out remapping since he uses a relative pointing device. However, Keller teaches remapping the pointing device to the other one of the displays (Column 4 lines 1-31, shifting focus with an input device, (stylus)). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Keller with the method of Haken. Motivation to do so would have been to provide more accurate representation than relative methods.

As per claim 40, Haken teaches a method for mapping a pointing device to multiple displays, said method comprising: mapping the pointing device to a first display; and automatically remapping the pointing device to a second display (Column 3 lines 16-39). Haken fails to distinctly point out remapping since he uses a relative pointing device. However, Keller teaches remapping the pointing device to the other one of the displays (Column 4 lines 1-31, shifting focus with an input device, (stylus)). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the

teaching of Keller with the method of Haken. Motivation to do so would have been to provide more accurate representation than relative methods.

As per claim 41, Haken-Keller teaches the method of claim 40, wherein the step of automatically remapping the pointing device to the second display includes: receiving a predefined input via the pointing device indicative of a user's desire to use the second display (Haken, Column 3 lines 35-39); and remapping the pointing device to the second display responsive to receipt of the predefined input (Haken, Column 3 lines 16-39).

As per claim 42, Haken teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising: a first field containing data indicative of a particular display; and a second field containing data indicative of said particular display's position relative to a second display (Column 4 lines 3-19). Haken fails to distinctly point out remapping since he uses a relative pointing device. However, Keller teaches remapping the pointing device between said second display and said particular display (Column 4 lines 1-31, shifting focus with an input device, (stylus)). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Keller with the method of Haken. Motivation to do so would have been to provide more accurate representation than relative methods.

As per claim 43, Haken-Keller teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 42, wherein: said second field contains perimeter coordinates associated with a display area of said particular display (Haken, Column 3 lines 35-39).

As per claim 44, Haken-Keller teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 42, wherein said second field contains data indicative of the position of a boundary between said particular display and said second display (Haken, Column 3 lines 35-39).

As per claim 45, Haken-Keller teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 44, wherein said data structure further comprises a third field containing data indicative of said second display (Haken, Column 2 lines 63-67).

7. Claims 12,13,27,28,34,35,36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haken ("Haken" US 7,124,374) and Keller ("Keller", US 6,842,795) in view of Numazaki ("Numazaki", US 5,990,893).

As per claim 12, Haken-Keller fails to distinctly point out timing the pointing device. However, Numazaki teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, and further including determining how long the pointing device has indicated the position

corresponding to the other one of the displays (Column 7 lines 35-63). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Numazaki with the method of Haken-Keller. Motivation to do so would have been so that command would not accidentally be assigned to a different device.

As per claim 13, Haken-Keller-Numazaki teaches the pointing device control method of claim 1, and further including: a preliminary step of setting an elapsed time which the pointing device must remain indicating a position near an edge before the pointing device is remapped (Numazaki, Column 7 lines 35-63).

Claim 27 is similar in scope to that of claim 12, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is similar in scope to that of claim 13, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 34, Haken-Keller-Numazaki teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 31, and further including a preset time field containing data representing an activation time period (Numazaki, Column 7 lines 35-63).

As per claim 35, Haken-Keller-Numazaki teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 31, and further including an elapsed time field containing data representing an elapsed time (Numazaki, Column 7 lines 35-63).

As per claim 36, Haken-Keller-Numazaki the computer-readable medium of claim 35, wherein the elapsed time is a time, which a pointing device has remained in a designated zone (Numazaki, Column 7 lines 35-63).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 4/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Keller fails to teach mapping when a cursor is moved between displays. Keller however, teaches a system with two pdas both which employ absolute mapping systems, and furthermore teaches shifting focus from one device to the other when rules are implemented. Keller further describes in some cases changing focus by positioning the cursor will activate the new device to receive input and deactivate the other device to be incapable of receiving input. In the case of both devices being a pda, as known in an absolute positioning system, once the second device receives input the cursor will be placed in the position the user is pointing to.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **RYAN F. PITARO** whose telephone number is (571)272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. F. P./  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

/Stephen S. Hong/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2178

RFP